





Robert Greene Sterne Jorge A. Goldstein David K.S. Cornwell Robert W. Esmond Tracy-Gene G. Durkin Michele A. Cimbala Michael B. Ray Robert E. Sokohl Eric K. Steffe Michael Q. Lee John M. Covert Robert C. Millonig Donald J. Featherstone Timothy J. Shea, Jr Michael V. Messinger Judith U. Kim Jeffrey T. Helvey Eldora L. Ellison

Peter A. Jackman Brian J. Del Buono Mark Fox Evens Vincent L. Capuano Elizabeth J. Haanes Michael D. Specht Kevin W. McCabe Glenn J. Perry
Edward W. Yee
Grant E. Reed
Virgil Lee Beaston
Theodore A. Wood
Joseph S. Ostroff
Jason D. Eisenberg
Track J. Muiller Tracy L. Muller Jon E. Wright LuAnne M. DeSantis

Donald R. Banowit

Ann E. Summerfield Helene C. Carlson Cynthia M. Bouche Timothy A. Doyle Gaby L. Longsworth Lori A. Gordon Laura A. Vogel Bryan S. Wade Bashir M.S. Ali Shannon A. Carroll Anbar F. Khal Midhelle K. Holoubek Marsha A. Rose Marsha A. Rose Scott A. Schaller Lei Zhou W. Blake Coblentz James J. Pohl John T. Haran

Mark W. Rygiel Michael R. Malek* Carla Ji-Eun Kim Doyle A. Siever* Ulrike Winkler Jenks Paul A. Calvo Robert A. Schwartzman C. Matthew Rozier Shameek Ghose Randall K. Baldwin Daniel J. Nevrivy

Registered Patent Agents Karen R. Markowicz Matthew J. Dowd Mita Mukherjee Scott M. Woodhouse Peter A. Socarras

Attn: Mail Stop Amendment

Jeffrey K. Mills Danielle L. Letting Lori Brandes Steven C. Oppenheime Aaron S. Lukas Gauray Asthana

Of Counsel Edward J. Kessler Kenneth C. Bass III Christopher P. Wrist

*Admitted only in Maryland *Admitted only in Virginia •Practice Limited to

Federal Agencies

November 15, 2007

WRITER'S DIRECT NUMBER: (202) 772-8751 INTERNET ADDRESS: SWOODHOU@SKGF.COM

Art Unit 1635

Commissioner for Patents PO Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

U.S. Utility Patent Application

Application No. 10/551,466; § 371(c) Date: August 7, 2006

Conjugate for Gene Transfer Comprising Oligonucleotide and

Hydrophilic Polymer, Polyelectrolyte Complex Micelles Formed from

the Conjugate, and Methods for Preparation Thereof

Inventors: JEONG et al.

Our Ref: 2236.0180000/JUK/SMW

Sir:

Transmitted herewith for appropriate action are the following documents:

- 1. Reply to Restriction and Election of Species Requirements; and
- 2. Return postcard.

It is respectfully requested that the attached postcard be stamped with the date of filing of these documents, and that it be returned to our courier.

In the event that extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this patent application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-0036.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Scott M. Woodhouse Agent for Applicants Registration No. 54,747

Enclosures 749053_1.DOC

Sterne, Kessler, Goldstein & Fox PLLC. : 1100 New York Avenue, NW : Washington, DC 20005 : 202.371.2600 f 202.371.2540 : www.skgf.com



In re application of:

JEONG et al.

Appl. No.: 10/551,466

§ 371(c) Date: August 7, 2006

For: Conjugate for Gene Transfer Comprising Oligonucleotide and Hydrophilic Polymer,

Polyelectrolyte Complex Micelles
Formed from the Conjugate, and
Methods for Preparation Thereof

Confirmation No.: 4435

Art Unit: 1635

Examiner: Bowman, Amy Hudson

Atty. Docket: 2236.0180000/JUK/SMW

Reply to Restriction and Election of Species Requirements

Sir:

In reply to the Office Action dated October 15, 2007, requesting an election of one invention to prosecute in the above-referenced patent application, Applicants hereby provisionally elect to prosecute the invention of Group I, represented by claims 1-8. This election is made without prejudice to or disclaimer of the other claims or inventions disclosed.

In addition, Applicants provisionally elect as species: (1) from claim 4, polyethylene glycol, (2) from claim 5, an acid-cleavable linkage, (3) from claim 6, a phosphodiester bond, (4) from claim 7, an antisense oligonucleotide, and (5) from claim 8, c-myb. Applicants assert the right to claim additional species in the event that a generic claim hereto is found allowable in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.141(a).

Both elections are made with traverse. The inventions of Groups I, III and VI are related as subcombination-combination. The micelle of claims 11-12 (Group III) as well as of claims 11 and 13 (Group IV) require a conjugate of Group I. Thus, two-way distinctness has not been shown between Group I and each of Groups III-IV. Moreover,

a search of Groups I would inevitably cover Groups II-IV, and thus would not present an undue burden to the U.S.P.T.O. The burden is on the Examiner to demonstrate a *prima* facie undue burden. See, e.g., MPEP § 803.

Further, Groups III and IV both include claim 11. Restriction practice is not applicable to a single claim. See *In re Weber*, 198 U.S.P.Q. 332 (C.C.P.A. 1978) and its companion case, *In re Haas*, 198 U.S.P.Q. 334 (C.C.P.A. 1978). These cases make it clear that 35 U.S.C. § 121 does not grant to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) the authority to refuse to examine a single claimed invention. Section 121 only applies to *plural* claimed inventions in *different* claims, where the different claims vary not just in scope, but in the invention to which each is directed. In view of this rule, Applicants submit that the restriction between Groups III and IV are improper since both groups restrict within a single claim, i.e., claim 11. Thus, Applicant's additionally request that the Examiner reconsider the restriction between Groups III and IV, and that they be rejoined.

Additionally, the Examiner failed to include claim 14 in any of Groups I-IV. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner clarify the Restriction Requirement to include claim 14.

With regards to the election of species, a reasonable number of species may be claimed when there is an allowable claim generic thereto. See, e.g., 37 CFR § 1.141 and MPEP § 806.04. In claims 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, there are only 3, 7, 4, 3 or 7 species listed. This certainly would fall within a reasonable number of species. Additionally, the members listed in claims 4-8 all have a common property and/or activity, and are disclosed as

Markush-type claims. It is well established that Markush-type claims are permitted in patent claims when they belong to an art-recognized class, such as in the present instance. See *Ex parte Markush*, 1925 C.D. 126 (Comm'r Pat. 1925). For example, the members listed in claim 4, i.e., polyethylene glycol, polyvinylpyrrolidone and polyoxaline, share common chemical properties as hydrophobic polymers and each member can be substituted one for the other with the expectation that the same intended result would be achieved. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner remove the requirement for an election of species from claims 4-8.

It is not believed that extensions of time are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in accompanying documents. However, if additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required therefor are hereby authorized to be charged to our Deposit Account No. 19-0036.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Scott M. Woodhouse Agent for Applicants

Registration No. 54,747

Date: November 15, 2007

1100 New York Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005-3934 (202) 371-2600